

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 2-11 are pending in the application, with claims 3 and 9 being the independent claims. Claim 1 is sought to be canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 2-6 and 9-11 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,532,017 to Knittel *et al.* (hereinafter "Knittel") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,016 to Kelleher (hereinafter "Kelleher"). (*See*, Office Action at ¶ 7.)

Regarding claim 1, Applicant has canceled this claim without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein, thereby rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

Regarding claims 2-11, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Amended independent claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein said determined viewing position is independent of an angle formed between a first direction from said determined viewing position to the scene and a second direction that coincides with a

boundary of the rectangular subvolume". Independent claim 9 has been similarly amended.

The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, *inter alia*, neither Knittel nor Kelleher discloses, teaches, or suggests this feature. To the contrary, Knittel expressly teaches: "the volume data set 10 is divided into parallel 'slices' 330 in the z direction (which as described above is the axis most nearly parallel to the view direction)." (Knittel at col. 19, lines 48-50.) Therefore, amended claims 3 and 9 are patentable over Knittel in view of Kelleher. Claims 4-8, 10, and 11 are also patentable over Knittel in view of Kelleher because they depend from claim 3 or claim 9 and because of the additional distinctive features of claims 4-8, 10, and 11.

Furthermore, claims 2-11 are patentable over Knittel in view of Kelleher even if the three-dimensional computer graphics data only includes data for a graphics primitive having vertices that lie within the rectangular subvolume to which a graphics processing unit is assigned. Claims 2-11 can include, but do not require, the three-dimensional computer graphics data to include data for a graphics primitive having a vertex that lies outside of the rectangular subvolume to which a graphics processing unit is assigned.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove his rejections of claims 2-11 under U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a

James L. Foran
Appl. No. 09/888,438

full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Timothy A. Doyle
Timothy A. Doyle
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 51,262

Date: 31 AUG 04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600